REMARKS

Claims 1 - 15 remain pending in the present application. No amendments were made by the present response. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested in view of the following discussion.

Examiner's Interview

The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's Interview conducted on August 7, 2003. The outstanding rejections set forth in the Office Action dated June 3, 2003 were discussed at the Examiner's Interview.

With regard to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, the interpretation of the various impurity regions (recited, for example, in claims 3 and 4) was discussed. For instance, the scope of the "second impurity region" (recited, for example, in claim 3) covers any impurity region "formed inside said first impurity region." In one embodiment of the present invention, depicted in Figure 1 for example, the claimed "second impurity region" could read on regions 4b and/or 4c.

Claim 4 (depending from claim 3) further defines the second impurity region as *including* third and fourth impurity regions. In other words, the scope of "second impurity region" is being further defined in claim 4 to include a third impurity region (e.g. 4b) and a fourth impurity region (e.g. 4c) that is embedded in the third impurity region.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/899,267 Request for Reconsideration dated September 2, 2003 Reply to Office Action of June 3, 2003

As agreed during the Examiner's Interview, the language recited in the claims (especially in claims 3 and 4) meet all the requirements under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Accordingly, all the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as well as the objections to the Drawings on similar grounds, should be withdrawn.

The distinctions over the prior art were also discussed during the Examiner's Interview. As explained, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest the claimed "diode structure" for the first source/drain region. For instance, **Choi et al.** (USP 6,330,187) only discloses a source/drain region 320/322 that have different concentration levels of doping. According to the description in **Choi**, 320 is a highly doped region and 322 is a lightly doped region. Doping at different concentration levels does not teach or suggest the present claimed diode structure that has different conductivity types (e.g. a combination of an n-type and a p-type region). As agreed during the Examiner's Interview, the present claimed diode structure patentably distinguishes over **Choi**. Accordingly, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 should be withdrawn.

As set forth in the Interview Summary, the Examiner indicated that a further search and/or consideration may be provided. The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's cooperation in this case. Since the outstanding objections and rejections should be withdrawn in view of the Examiner's Interview, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/899,267 Request for Reconsideration dated September 2, 2003 Reply to Office Action of June 3, 2003

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP

John P. Kong

Attorney for Applicant Reg. No. 40,054

JPK/kal Atty. Docket No. **010835** Suite 1000 1725 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006 (202) 659-2930

Customer Number 23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

H:\HOME\JPK\Prosecution\010835\Filings\Request for Reconsideration